arXiv:0803.0437v2 [math.NT] 14 Jan 2010

On finiteness of odd superperfect numbers*†

Tomohiro Yamada

Abstract

In this paper, some new results concerning the equation $\sigma(N) = aM, \sigma(M) = bN$ are proved, which implies that there are only finitely many odd superperfect numbers with a fixed number of distinct prime factors.

1 Introduction

As usual, we denote by $\sigma(N)$ the sum of positive divisors of a positive integer N and call a positive integer N to be perfect if $\sigma(N) = 2N$. Though it is not known whether or not an odd perfect number exists, many conditions which must be satisfied by such a number are known.

Analogous to this notion, Suryanarayana [11] called N to be superperfect if $\sigma(\sigma(N)) = 2N$. Suryanarayana showed that if N is even superperfect, then $N = 2^m$ with $2^{m+1} - 1$ prime, and if N is odd superperfect, then N must be square and have at least two distinct prime factors.

Dandapat, Hunsucker and Pomerance [2] showed that if $\sigma(\sigma(N)) = kN$ for some integer k and $\sigma(N)$ is a prime power, then N is even superperfect or $N = 21, k = 3$. Later Pomerance [6] called N to be super multiply perfect if $\sigma(\sigma(N)) = kN$ for some integer k and showed that if $p^e \mid \sigma(N)$ and $N \mid \sigma(p^e)$ for some prime power p^e, then $N = 2^{k-1}$ or $2^k - 1$ with $2^k - 1$ prime or $N = 15, 21, 1023$.

In West Coast Number Theory Conference 2005, the author posed the question whether there exist only finitely many odd integers N such that $N \mid \sigma(\sigma(N))$ and $\omega(\sigma(N)) = k$ for each fixed k [12], where $\omega(n)$ denotes the number of distinct prime factors of n. The above-mentioned result of Dandapat, Hunsucker and Pomerance answers the special case $k = 1$ of this question affirmatively.

Concerning the unitary divisor sum $\sigma^*(N)$ (d is called a unitary divisor of N if $d \mid N$ and $d, N/d$ are coprime), the author already proved that, $N = 9, 165$ are all of the odd integers satisfying $\sigma^*(\sigma^*(N)) = 2N$ [13].

In this paper, though we cannot prove the above-mentioned conjecture, the following results are proved. First we note that, for each i, $C_i(\ldots)$ denotes some effectively computable constant depending only on its arguments.

---

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 11A05, 11A25.

†Key words and phrases: Odd perfect numbers.

Theorem 1.1. *If a quadruple of integers* N, M, a, b *satisfies* $\sigma(N) = aM$, $\sigma(M) = bN$ *and* $\omega(\sigma(N)) \leq k$, *then we have* $a, b < C(k)$ *for some effectively computable constant* $C(k)$ *depending only on* k. *Moreover,* M *and* N *must have a prime factor smaller than some effectively computable constant* $B(k)$ *depending only on* k.

Theorem 1.2. *For any given integers* a, b, k, k', *there are only finitely many pairs of integers* M, N *satisfying* $\sigma(N) = aM, \sigma(M) = bN$ *with* $\omega_s(N) \leq k'$ *and* $\omega(M) \leq k$, *where* $\omega_s(N)$ *denotes the number of prime factors of* N *dividing* N *only once. Moreover, such integers* M, N *can be bounded by some effectively computable constant depending only on* a, b, k, k'.

Using Suryanarayana's result that an odd superperfect number must be square, the latter result gives the following corollary, which implies our conjecture in the case $\sigma(\sigma(N)) = 2N$.

Corollary 1.3. *There exist only finitely many odd superperfect numbers* N *with* $\omega(\sigma(N)) = k$ *for each fixed* k, *which are bounded by some effectively computable constant depending only on* k.

Our argument in this paper is based upon the one in [13]. In [13], we used the fact that if $\sigma^*(\sigma^*(N)) = 2N$, then N must be factored into $N = \prod_i p_i^{e_i}$ with $p_i^{e_i} + 1 = 2^{a_i} q^{b_i}$ for some integers a_i, b_i, q. This means that $p_i^{e_i}$'s must be distributed very thin and therefore the product of $\sigma^*(p_i^{e_i})/p_i^{e_i}$'s must be small.

However, we deal with the σ function in this paper. For a small prime p, $\sigma(p^e)/p^e$ must be fairly large and therefore our argument in [13] does not work.

We introduce some preliminary notations. We denote the prime divisors of $\sigma(N) = aM$ by $q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_k$. For each subset I of $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$, we denote by $S_{I,e}$ the set of primes p such that

$$\frac{p^e - 1}{p - 1} = \prod_{i \in I} q_i^{a_i} \tag{1}$$

for some positive integers $a_i (i \in I)$. Clearly, all prime divisor of N belongs to some $S_{I,e}$. We put $S_I = \cup_e S_{I,e}, S = \cup_I S_I, Q_I = \max_{i \in I} q_i$ and $Q = \max_{i=1,2,\ldots,k} q_i$.

Using the lower bound of linear forms of logarithms, we shall show in Section 4 that S_I contains at most $2k$ primes below $\exp\left(C(\log Q_I / \log\log Q_I)^{1/(2k+4)}\right)$, where C is an effectively computable constant depending only on k. We use this fact to overcome the above-mentioned obstacle. Large primes will be dealt with in Section 3. Combining them, we prove Theorem 1.1. With aid of a diophantine inequality shown in Section 6, we prove Theorem 1.2.

2 Preliminary lemmas

In this section, we introduce some preliminary lemmas.

The first lemma is Matveev's lower bound for linear forms of logarithms [5]. We use this lemma to prove our gap principle in section 4. The second lemma is an elementary property of values of cyclotomic polynomials.

Lemma 2.1. *Let* $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$ *be nonzero integers with some fixed not all zero values of* $\log a_1, \ldots, \log a_n$. *For each* $j = 1, \ldots, n$, *let* $A_j \geq \max\{0.16, |\log a_j|\}$.

Put

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \max\{1, |b_1|\, A_1/A_n, |b_2|\, A_2/A_n, \ldots, |b_n|\}, \\ \Omega &= A_1 A_2 \ldots A_n, \\ C_0 &= 1 + \log 3 - \log 2, \\ C_1(n) &= \frac{16}{n!} e^n (2n+3)(n+2)(4(n+1))^{n+1} (\frac{1}{2} en)(4.4n + 5.5 \log n + 7) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and

$$\Lambda = b_1 \log a_1 + \ldots + b_n \log a_n. \tag{3}$$

Then we have $\Lambda = 0$ *or*

$$\log |\Lambda| > -C_1(n)(C_0 + \log B) \max\left\{1, \frac{n}{6}\right\} \Omega. \tag{4}$$

Lemma 2.2. *If* a, e *are integers with* $a \geq 2$ *and* $e \geq 3$, $(a^e - 1)/(a - 1)$ *must have at least* $\omega(e) - 1$ *prime factors, at least one of which is congruent to* $1 \pmod{e}$.

Proof. If $(a, e) = (2, 6)$, then the statement can be easily confirmed. Hence we assume that $(a, e) \neq (2, 6)$.

A well known result of Zsigmondy [14] states that if $(a, n) \neq (2, 6)$ and $n > 1$, then $a^n - 1$ has a prime factor which does not divide $a^m - 1$ for any $m < n$.

Applying this result to each prime divisor $p > 2$ of e, we see that $(a^e - 1)/(a - 1)$ must have at least $\omega(e) - 1$ prime factors.

Since $e \geq 3$, We apply Zsigmondy's result with $n = e$ and obtain that $(a^e - 1)/(a - 1)$ has a prime factor q which does not divide $(a^d - 1)/(a - 1)$ for any $d < e$. We see that $a \pmod{q}$ has exponent e and therefore $q \equiv 1 \pmod{e}$. □

3 The distribution of large primes in S

In this section, we shall give an upper bound for the sum $\sum_{p \in S_{I,e}, p > X} 1/p$ for each fixed I, e.

Lemma 3.1. *Let* p_0, p_1, p_2 *be distinct primes,* e *and* f *be positive integers. Put* $H_i = f \log p_0 / \log p_i$ *for* $i = 1, 2$. *If the equation*

$$p_i^e \equiv 1 \pmod{p_0^f} \tag{5}$$

holds for $i = 1, 2$, *then*

$$\frac{1}{2} H_1 H_2 \leq (e, p_0 - 1). \tag{6}$$

Proof. It is clear that $p_1^{a_1} p_2^{a_2}$ takes distinct values modulo p_0^f for each a_1 and a_2 with $0 \leq a_1 \log p_1 + a_2 \log p_2 < f \log p_0$. So that $p_1^{a_1} p_2^{a_2}$ takes at least $H_1 H_2 / 2$ distinct values modulo p_0^f. But this takes at most $(e, p_0 - 1)$ distinct values since both p_1 and p_2 have residual orders dividing $(e, p_0 - 1)$ modulo p_0^f by (5). Hence we obtain $H_1 H_2 / 2 \leq (e, p_0 - 1)$. □

Lemma 3.2. *Let* p_0, p_1, p_2 *be distinct primes with* $p_2 > p_1$ *and* q, s *be positive integers. If* $e > 3s^2$ *and there are integers* f_1, f_2 *such that* $p_0^{f_i} \mid \sigma(p_i^{e-1})$ *and* $p_0^{f_i} \geq \sigma(p_i^{e-1})^{1/s}$ *for* $i = 1, 2$*, then*

$$\log p_2 > \frac{9}{8} \log p_1. \tag{7}$$

Proof. Let $f = \min\{f_1, f_2\}$ and $H_i = f \log p_0 / \log p_i$. Then it is clear that $H_i \geq (e-1)/s$. By Lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$\log p_2 \geq \frac{1}{2e} H_1^2 \log p_1 \geq \frac{(e-1)^2}{2es^2} \log p_1. \tag{8}$$

Since $e > 3s^2$, we obtain (7). □

Using this result, we obtain the following inequality.

Lemma 3.3. *We have*

$$\sum_{p > X, p \in S_{I,e}} \frac{1}{p} < \frac{C_3(s)(\log X)^k}{X} \tag{9}$$

for $X > 2$.

Remark 3.4. It is well known that $S_{I,e}$ consists of only finitely many elements if $e > 2$. Combining Coates's theorem [1] and Schinzel's theorem [9], it follows that the elements of $S_{I,e}$ are bounded by an effectively computable constant depending on e and q_i's. For details of history of the largest prime factor of polynomial values, see Chapter 7 of Shorey and Tijdeman's book [10]. Two theorems of Evertse [3][4] implies that $|S_{I,e}|$ is bounded by an effectively computable constant depending on e, k. However, in this paper, we need a result depending only on k.

Proof. First we note that $S_{I,e}$ can be divided into $k = |I|$ sets $S_{I,e,i} (i \in I)$ so that $q_i^{f_i} \mid \sigma(p^{e-1})$ and $q_i^{f_i} \geq \sigma(p^{e-1})^{1/k}$ if $p \in S_{I,e,i}$.

Assume that $e > 3k^2$. If $p_1 < p_2$ are two primes belonging to $S_{I,e,i}$, then $\log p_2 > (9/8) \log p_1$ by Corollary 3.2. Now it is clear that

$$\sum_{p > X, p \in S_{I,e}} \frac{1}{p} < \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{p > X, p \in S_{I,e,i}} \frac{1}{p} < \frac{C_4(k)}{X}. \tag{10}$$

Assume that $e \leq 3k^2$. The number of primes $p < x$ belonging to $S_{I,e}$ is at most $(e \log x)^k / \prod_i \log q_i$ and partial summation gives

$$\sum_{p > X, p \in S_{I,e}} \frac{1}{p} < C_5(k) \frac{(e \log X)^k}{X}. \tag{11}$$

Since $e \leq 3k^2$, we have $(e \log X)^k \leq (3k^2 \log X)^k$ and therefore we obtain

$$C_5(k) \frac{(e \log X)^k}{X} \leq C_6(k) \frac{(\log X)^k}{X}. \tag{12}$$

□

4 Main Theory

In this section, we shall prove that there are only a few numbers of small prime solutions for a certain system of exponential diophantine equations. This lemma plays the most essential role in this paper.

We begin by proving the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let* $s, n_1, \ldots, n_s, l_1, \ldots, l_{s+1}$ *be integers. Let* $p_1, \ldots, p_{s+1}$ *be distinct primes and* $m_i = p_i$ *or* p_i^2 *for each* $i = 1, \ldots, s+1$. *Assume that there exist integers* $a_{ij} (1 \leq i \leq s+1, 1 \leq j \leq s)$ *such that*

$$\frac{m_j^{l_j} - 1}{m_j - 1} = \prod_{i=1}^{s} n_i^{a_{ij}} \tag{13}$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, s+1$. *Then we have*

$$l_\nu < C_7(s)(\log l_\mu + \log\log m_\mu) \prod_{j=1}^{s+1} (\log m_j)^2 \tag{14}$$

for some indices μ, ν.

Proof. We denote by A the maximal absolute value of a_{ij} and define α, κ, λ, μ such that $n_\alpha = \min n_i$, $m_\kappa^{l_\kappa} = \min m_j^{l_j}$, $m_\lambda = \max m_j$ and $m_\mu^{l_\mu} = \max m_j^{l_j}$.

We begin by observing that (13) implies the existence of integers b_1, …, b_{s+1} not all zero with absolute values at most $((s+1)^{1/2}A)^s$ such that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{s+1} \left(\frac{m_j^{l_j} - 1}{m_j - 1} \right)^{b_j} = 1 \tag{15}$$

by an improved form of Siegel's lemma (the original form of Siegel's lemma gives the upper bound $1 + ((s+1)A)^s$. For detail, see Chapter I of [8]). So that there exists the unique index β such that p_β is as large as possible under the condition that $b_j l_j \neq 0$.

Writing $\Lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{s+1} b_j l_j \log m_j - b_j \log(m_j - 1)$, this yields the inequality

$$|\Lambda| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{s+1} \frac{b_j}{m_j^{l_j} - 1} \leq \frac{2(s+1)(sA)^s}{m_\kappa^{l_\kappa}}. \tag{16}$$

We see that Λ does not vanish since $v_{p_\beta}(\exp \Lambda) > 0$. Hence, by Matveev's theorem, we have

$$\log|\Lambda| \geq -C_1(2(s+1))(\log B + C_0) \prod_{j=1}^{s+1} (\log m_j)^2, \tag{17}$$

where $B = \max\{b_j l_j \log m_j / \log m_\lambda \mid 1 \leq j \leq s+1\}$. Combining inequalities (16) and (17), we have

$$l_\kappa \log m_\kappa \leq s \log A + C_8(s)(\log B) \prod_{j=1}^{s+1} (\log m_j)^2. \tag{18}$$

Now the Lemma follows from (18) using trivial estimates

$$A \le l_\mu \log m_\mu / \log n_\alpha \tag{19}$$

and

$$B \le (sA)^s l_\mu \log m_\mu / \log m_\lambda \le s^s (l_\mu \log m_\mu / \log 2)^{s+1}. \tag{20}$$

□

Using Lemma 4.1, we can prove a gap principle for the divisors of N.

Lemma 4.2. *Let I be an arbitrary subset of $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. There are at most $2k$ distinct primes p for which there exist some positive integers $d, e, a_i (i \in I)$ with $d = 1$ or $d = 2$ such that*

$$\frac{p^{de} - 1}{p^d - 1} = \prod_{i \in I} q_i^{a_i} \tag{21}$$

and

$$p < \exp\left(C_9(k)(\log Q_I / \log\log Q_I)^{1/(2k+4)}\right). \tag{22}$$

Proof. In order to prove this lemma, we apply the previous lemma twice.

Assume that there exist $2k + 1$ prime powers $p_1^{e_1}, \ldots, p_{2k+1}^{e_{2k+1}}$ with $p_1, \ldots, p_{2k+1}$ distinct, satisfying (21) with $p^d = p_i, e = e_i$. Denote $P = \max\{p_1, \ldots, p_{2k+1}\}$ and assume that $P < \exp((\log Q_I)^{1/2})$.

Let J_1 be the set of indices j for which

$$e_j > C_7(k)(\log Q_I + \log\log P)(\log P)^{2(k+1)}. \tag{23}$$

By Lemma 2.2, we have $e_i \le Q_I$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, 2(k + 1)$. Applying Lemma 4.1 with $m_j = p_{s_j}, l_j = e_{s_j}, n_i = q_i, a_{ij} = f_{i,s_j}$ for all subsequences $(s_j)_{1 \le j \le |I|+1}$ of $\{1, 2, \ldots, 2k + 1\}$, we see that J_1 consists of at most $|I| \le k$ elements.

Next we apply Lemma 4.1 to $k + 1$ arbitrarily chosen primes which do not belong to J_1. Let J_2 be the set of indices of j outside J_1 for which

$$e_j > C_7(k)(\log G(k) + \log\log Q_I + (2k + 3)\log\log P)(\log P)^{2(k+1)}, \tag{24}$$

where $G(k)$ denotes the right hand side of (23). Now we see that Lemma 4.1 gives that J_2 consists of at most $|I| \le k$ elements since $e_j \le G(k)$ for any j outside J_1.

Since q_i divides $(p_j^{e_j} - 1)/(p_j - 1)$ for every i, j, we have $p_j^{e_j} > Q_I$. Therefore, choosing the index j outside $J_1 \cup J_2$, we have

$$\log P > (\log Q_I)/e_j > C_{10}(k) \frac{\log Q_I}{(\log P)^{2k+3}(\log\log Q_I)}. \tag{25}$$

Hence we obtain

$$\log P > C_9(k)(\log Q_I / \log\log Q_I)^{1/(2k+4)}, \tag{26}$$

as stated in the lemma. □

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

First we note that we may assume that $N, M > 1$.

Let $Q_I = \max_{i \in I} q_i$ and $Q = \max_{i=1,2,\ldots,k} q_i$. By Lemma 2.2, we see that e must divide $q_i - 1$ for some $i \in I$ and $\omega(e) \leq k+1$. Hence the number of possible choices of e does not exceed the number of divisors of $\prod_i (q_i - 1)$ having at most $k+1$ prime factors. Clearly this is at most

$$(\log(\prod_i (q_i - 1))/\log 2)^{k+1} \leq (k \log Q_I/\log 2)^{k+1}. \tag{27}$$

In order to apply Lemmas 3.3 and 4.2, let us denote by $T_{I,e}$ the subset of $S_{I,e}$ consisting of primes below
$\exp(C_{11}(k)(\log Q_I/\log\log Q_I)^{1/(2k+4)})$ and put $T_I = \bigcup_e T_{I,e}$.

It follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$\sum_{p \in S_{I,e} \setminus T_{I,e}} \frac{1}{p} < \exp(-C_{11}(k)(\log Q_I/\log\log Q_I)^{1/(2k+4)}). \tag{28}$$

By virtue of (27), summation of these sums over e gives

$$\sum_{p \in S_I \setminus T_I} \frac{1}{p} < \exp(-C_{12}(k)(\log Q_I/\log\log Q_I)^{1/(2k+4)}). \tag{29}$$

By Lemma 4.2, we have $|\bigcup_e T_{I,e}| \leq 2k$. Hence we obtain

$$\sum_{p \in S_I} \frac{1}{p} = \sum_{p \in S_I \setminus T_I} \frac{1}{p} + \sum_{p \in T_I} \frac{1}{p} < C_{13}(k) + 2kC_{14}(k) = C_{15}(k). \tag{30}$$

It immediately follows that $\sum_{p \in S} 1/p < 2^k C_{16}(k) = C_{17}(k)$. This gives $h(N) < \prod_{p \in S} p/(p-1) < C_{18}(k), h(M) < \prod_{i=1}^k q_i/(q_i-1) < C_{19}(k)$. Therefore we have $ab = \sigma(M)\sigma(N)/(MN) = h(M)h(N) < C_{20}(k)$. This gives the former statement of Theorem 1.1.

Next we prove the latter statement of Theorem 1.1. First, it is clear that

$$\sum_{q_i \geq B} \frac{1}{q_i} < \frac{k}{B}. \tag{31}$$

If $B \geq \exp(C_{11}(k)(\log Q_I/\log\log Q_I)^{1/(2k+4)})$, then (29) and Lemma 3.3 gives

$$\sum_{p \in S_I, p \geq B} \frac{1}{p} < \frac{C_{21}(k)}{B}. \tag{32}$$

By Lemma 4.2, S_I consists of at most $2k$ primes below
$\exp(C_{11}(k)(\log Q_I/\log\log Q_I)^{1/(2k+4)})$. Thus, for any B we have

$$\sum_{p \in S_I, p \geq B} \frac{1}{p} < \frac{C_{21}(k) + 2k}{B} = \frac{C_{22}(k)}{B}. \tag{33}$$

The right hand sides of these inequalities tends to zero as B goes to infinity for any given k. This clearly implies the latter statement of Theorem 1.1. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

6 Approximation of rational numbers

In this section, we shall prove a lemma concerning diophantine approximation which is used to prove Theorem 1.2. Let $h(N) = \sigma(N)/N$. Pomerance's theorem [7] states that for any mutually distinct primes $p_1, \ldots, p_s$ there is an effectively computable constant $\delta(s, n, p_1, \ldots, p_s) > 0$ such that $n/d - h(p_1^{e_1} \ldots p_s^{e_s}) > \delta(s, n, p_1, \ldots, p_s)$ if the following condition holds:

$$n/d - h(p_1^{e_1} \ldots p_s^{e_s}) > 0, \text{ and there exists an integer } m \text{ such that } h(mp_1^{e_1} \cdots p_s^{e_s}) = n/d \text{ and every prime factor of } m \text{ is larger than all of } p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_s. \tag{34}$$

We shall show that, under the assumption that N is odd, we can relax the condition that $p_1, \ldots, p_s$ be mutually distince and we can take δ independent of $p_1, \ldots, p_s$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \ldots \leq p_s$ be odd (not necessarily distinct) primes and n, d be integers with n/d having an odd denominator when written in lowest terms. Denote by $\underline{\delta}(s, n, p_1, \ldots, p_s)$ the infimum of positive numbers of the form*

$$\frac{n}{d} - \prod_{i=1}^{s} h(p_i^{e_i}), \tag{35}$$

where $e_1, \ldots, e_s$ are nonnegative integers such that the condition (34) holds.

If $\prod_{i=1}^{s} h(p_s^{e_s}) < n/d$, then we have

$$\underline{\delta}(s, n, p_1, \ldots, p_s) \geq \frac{1}{C_{23}(s) n^{2^s} \prod_{i=1}^{s} (p_i - 1)^{2^s - 2^{s-i}}}, \tag{36}$$

where $C_{23}(s)$ denotes the constant defined by the recurrence relation

$$C_{23}(1) = 1, C_{23}(i+1) = (2(i+1))^{2^i} C_{23}(i) \tag{37}$$

for each positive integer s.

Proof. We note that i) Pomerance's argument use the assumption that $p_1, \ldots, p_s$ are mutually distinct only in the case $n/d = \prod_{i=1}^{s} p_i/(p_i - 1)$ and ii) we cannot have $n/d = \prod_{i=1}^{s} p_i/(p_i - 1)$ since, in reduced forms, the left has an odd denominator while the right has an even one. Here the fact that n/d must have an odd denominator in its reduced form follows from the assumption that $h(mp_1^{e_1} \cdots p_s^{e_s}) = n/d$ for some integer m whose prime factors are larger than all of p_s.

This leaves two cases.

Case 1: $n/d > \prod_{i=1}^{s} p_i/(p_i - 1)$. In this case Pomerance's argument(see page 200 of [7]) shows that

$$\underline{\delta}(s, n, p_1, \ldots, p_s) \geq \frac{1}{n \prod (p_i - 1)}. \tag{38}$$

Case 2: $n/d < \prod_{i=1}^{s} p_i/(p_i - 1)$. In this case Pomerance's argument yields that, if $s \geq 2$, then

$$\underline{\delta}(s, n, p_1, \ldots, p_s) \geq h(p_l^{a_l}) \underline{\delta}(s - 1, np_l^{a_l}, p_1, \ldots, \hat{p}_l, \ldots, p_s) \tag{39}$$

for some $1 \leq l \leq s, 1 \leq a_l \leq x_l$, where $x_i = \log(2sn \prod_{j=1}^{s}(p_j - 1))/\log p_i$. Moreover, Pomerance shows that $\underline{\delta}(1, n, p_1) \geq 1/(n^2(p_1 - 1))$ in page 199 of [6].

In both cases, we see that the inequality (36) holds for $s = 1$ since $\frac{n}{d} - h(p_1^{e_1}) > \frac{1}{n^2(p_1-1)}$.

We show that if (36) is valid for $s = t$, then (36) is also valid for $s = t + 1$. By (38) and (39), we have

$$\frac{n}{d} - h(p_1^{e_1} \dots p_{t+1}^{e_{t+1}}) \geq \frac{1}{n \prod(p_i - 1)} \tag{40}$$

or

$$\frac{n}{d} - h(p_1^{e_1} \dots p_{t+1}^{e_{t+1}}) \geq \underline{\delta}(t, np_i^{a_i}, p_1, \dots, \hat{p}_l, \dots, p_{t+1}) \tag{41}$$

for some $1 \leq l \leq t + 1, 1 \leq a_l \leq x_l$, where $x_l = \log(2(t + 1)n \prod_{j=1}^{t+1}(p_j - 1))/\log p_l$.

Since the right hand side of (36) is a monotonously decreasing function for $n, p_1, \dots, p_s$, we see that the right hand side of (41) takes its smallest value when $l = 1$ and $a_l = \lfloor x_l \rfloor$. Now, by the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n}{d} - h(p_1^{e_1} \dots p_{t+1}^{e_{t+1}}) &\geq \frac{1}{C_{23}(t)(2t)^{2^t} n^{2^{t+1}} (p_1 - 1)^{2^t} \prod_{i=2}^{t+1}(p_i - 1)^{2^t+(2^t-2^{t-(i-1)})}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{C_{23}(t + 1)n^{2^{t+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{t+1}(p_i - 1)^{2^{t+1}-2^{(t+1)-i}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

□

Lemma 6.2. *If n, d are integers with d odd, $p_1, \dots, p_s$ are any odd (not necessarily distinct) primes and $e_1, \dots, e_s$ are nonnegative integers such that the condition (34) holds, then the inequality*

$$\frac{n}{d} - \prod_{i=1}^{s} h(p_i^{e_i}) > C_{24}(s, n) \tag{43}$$

holds for effectively computable constants $C_{24}(s, n)$ depending only on s, n.

Proof. For $s = 0$, we have a trivial estimate $C_{24}(0, n) \geq n/(n - 1) - 1 > 1/n$.

Next, we shall show that we can compute $C_{24}(s + 1, n)$ in term of $C_{24}(s, n)$. This gives the lemma by induction. If

$$p_i > \frac{2n}{dC_{24}(s, n)} - 1 \tag{44}$$

for some i, then we have

$$\frac{p_i}{p_i - 1} = (1 - \frac{1}{p_i})^{-1} < \left(1 - \frac{\frac{C_{24}(s,n)}{2}}{\frac{n}{d} - \frac{C_{24}(s,n)}{2}}\right)^{-1} = \frac{\frac{n}{d} - \frac{C_{52}(s,n)}{2}}{\frac{n}{d} - C_{24}(s, n)} \tag{45}$$

and therefore we obtain

$$\prod_{i=1}^{s+1} h(p_i^{e_i}) \leq \left(\frac{n}{d} - C_{24}(s, n)\right) \times \frac{p_i}{p_i - 1} < \frac{n}{d} - \frac{C_{24}(s, n)}{2}. \tag{46}$$

Hence either of the following two inequalities holds: $C_{24}(s+1,n) \geq C_{24}(s,n)/2$ or

$$C_{24}(s+1,n) \geq \min \underline{\delta}(s+1,n,p_1,\ldots,p_{s+1}), \tag{47}$$

where $p_1,\ldots,p_{s+1}$ run all primes below $\frac{2n}{dC_{24}(s,n)}$. Lemma 6.1 ensures that $C_{24}(s+1,n)$ is positive and effectively computable. □

7 Proof of Theorem 1.2

We prove that for any nonnegative integer s we have $q_{s+1} < C_{25}(s+1)$ under the assumption that $q_1,\ldots,q_s < C_{25}(s)$.

We shall show that we must have $\prod_i h(p_i^{e_i}) \prod_j h(q_j^{f_j}) < ab$ under the assumption that $N \geq C_{26}(a,b,s)$ and $q_{s+1} \geq C_{25}(s+1)$. This gives $q_{s+1} < C_{25}(s+1)$ since we must have $\prod_i h(p_i^{e_i}) \prod_j h(q_j^{f_j}) = ab$,

We denote by $B_i(X)$ some effectively computable function of X depending only on a,b,s and tending to infinity as X goes to infinity.

Each prime factor p of N with $p^{e-1} \mid\mid N$ can be classified into one of four classes:

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= \{p \mid e = 2\}, \\ U_2 &= \{p \mid e > 2 \text{ and all prime factors of } (p^d-1)/(p^l-1) \text{ are in } q_1,\ldots,q_s \\ &\quad , \text{ for some } d \mid e, d > 2\}, \\ U_3 &= \{p \mid e > 2 \text{ and all prime factors of } (p^d-1)/(p^l-1) \text{ are in } q_{s+1},\ldots,q_k, \\ &\quad \text{ for some } d \mid e, d > 2\}, \\ U_4 &= \{p \mid p \mid N, p \notin U_1 \cup U_2 \cup U_3\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $l = (d,2)$.

By assumption, U_1 consists of at most k' primes. Two theorems of Evertse [3][4] implies that there are at most $C_{27}(s)$ primes $p \in U_2$. Lemma 4.2 yields that there are at most $C_{28}(k)$ primes below $B_1(q_{s+1})$ in U_3. Therefore, $U_1 \cup U_2 \cup U_3$ consists of at most $k' + C_{29}(k)$ primes (This point is the only point which requires that $\omega_s(M)$ be bounded. We note that $s \leq k$).

Assume that $p \in U_4$. Since $p \notin U_3$, some q_i with $i \leq s$ must divide $(p^e-1)/(p^{(e,2)}-1)$. Take the smallest positive integer d such that q_i divides $(p^d-1)/(p^{(d,2)}-1)$. We have $d \mid e, d \geq 3$ since $p \notin U_3$. On the other hand $d = q_i$ or $d = \mathrm{ord} q_i \pmod p \leq q_i$. Since $p \notin U_2$, some q_j with $j > s$ must divide $(p^d-1)/(p^{(d,2)}-1)$. Thus we have $p > q_j^{1/d} \geq q_j^{1/q_i} \geq q_{s+1}^{1/C_{25}(s)}$. Therefore $p > B_2(q_{s+1})$ if $p \in U_4$.

Now we conclude that $p > B_3(q_{s+1})$ for every prime factor p of N except at most $C_{30}(k,k') = k' + C_{29}(k)$ primes.

By Lemma 6.2, we must have either

$$\prod_{p_i \leq B_3(q_{s+1})} h(p_i^{e_i}) \prod_j h(q_j^{f_j}) = ab \tag{48}$$

or

$$\prod_{p_i \le B_3(q_{s+1})} h(p_i^{e_i}) \prod_j h(q_j^{f_j}) \le ab - C_{31}(a,b,k,k'). \tag{49}$$

Assume that (48) holds. Let r be the largest prime among p_i's and q_j's. Dividing (48) by $r/(r-1)$, we have

$$\prod_{p_i \le B_3(q_{s+1}), p_i \ne r} h(p_i^{e_i}) \prod_{q_j \ne r} h(q_j^{f_j}) > ab(1 - \frac{1}{r}). \tag{50}$$

Since the left hand side is a product over at most $C_{30}(k,k')$ primes, we must have $r \le C_{31}(a,b,k,k')$ by Lemma 6.2. Hence $p_i, q_j < C_{31}(a,b,k,k')$ for any i, j. Since

$$\prod_{p_i \le B_3(q_{s+1})} \sigma(p_i^{e_i}) \prod_j \sigma(q_j^{e_j}) = ab \prod_{p_i \le B_3(q_{s+1})} p_i^{e_i} \prod_j q_j^{e_j}, \tag{51}$$

we must have $e_i, f_j < C_{32}(a,b,k,k')$ for any i, j by Lemma 2.2 and therefore $N < C_{33}(a,b,k,k')$.

Assume that (49) holds. Combining the upper bound estimate

$$\prod_{p_i > B_1(q_{s+1})} h(p_i^{e_i}) \le 1 + 1/B_4(q_{s+1}), \tag{52}$$

which can be obtained by (29), we conclude that $q_{s+1} \le C_{34}(a,b,k,k')$. This proves the theorem.

8 Concluding remarks

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 exhibited in the last section indicates that we can explicitly give the upper bound for N in terms of a, b, k, k'. However, the upper bound which our proof yields would become considerably large due to its inductive nature exhibited in the last section. For sufficiently large k, our proof yields

$$N < \exp\exp\ldots\exp(a+b+k+k') \tag{53}$$

where the number of iterations of the exponential function is $\ll k$ and $\gg k$.

References

[1] J. Coates, An effective p-adic analogue of a theorem of Thue II; The greatest prime factor of a binary form, Acta Arith. 16 (1969/70), 399–412.

[2] G. G. Dandapat, J. L. Hunsucker and Carl Pomerance, Some new results on odd perfect numbers, Pacific J. Math. 57 (1975), 359–364.

[3] J. -H. Evertse, On equations in S-units and the Thue-Mahler equation, Invent. Math. 75 (1984), 561–584.

[4] J. -H. Evertse, The number of solutions of the Thue-Mahler equation, J. Reine Angew. Math. 482 (1997), 121–149.

[5] E. M. Matveev, An explicit lower bound for a homogeneous rational linear form in the logarithms of algebraic numbers. II, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. 64 (2000), 125–180, Eng. trans., *Izv. Math.* **64** (2000), 127–169.

[6] C. Pomerance, On multiply perfect numbers with a special property, Pacific J. Math. 57 (1975), 511–517.

[7] C. Pomerance, Multiply perfect nubmers, Mersenne primes and effective computability, Math. Ann. 226 (1977), 195–206.

[8] A. Schmidt, Diophantine approximations and diophantine equations, Lecture Notes in Math. 1467, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.

[9] A. Schinzel, On two theorems of Gelfond and some of their applications, Acta Arith. 13 (1967), 177–236.

[10] T. N. Shorey and R. Tijdeman, Exponential diophantine equations, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.

[11] D. Suryanarayana, Super perfect numbers, Elem. Math. 24 (1969), 16–17.

[12] T. Yamada, Problem 005:10, Western Number Theory Problems, 2005. `http://web.newsguy.com/bartgoddard/problems2005.pdf`

[13] T. Yamada, Unitary super perfect numbers, Math. Pannon. 19 (2008), 37–47.

[14] K. Zsigmondy, Zur Theorie der Potenzreste, Monatsh. für Math. 3 (1882), 265–284.

Tomohiro Yamada
Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Science
Kyoto University
Kyoto, 606-8502
Japan
e-mail: `tyamada@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp`